

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 15 are in the application.

The Examiner will note that, as required in the Office Action, a new title has been provided for the present application.

The claims have been amended to overcome the objections in the last four lines of page 2 of the Office Action.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to make it clear that the fluid supply unit comprises a hydraulic supply unit.

The remaining claims have been amended as required.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 to 8, 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson in view of the Brochure "Hochdruck- und

Sonderhydraulik", are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the reference to "Hochdruck" is not a reference to be properly cited against the present application. The reference "Hochdruck" was cited during a hearing of the corresponding German application at the German Patent and Trademark Office on May 10, 2005. During that hearing, the German Examiner explained why he does not consider this reference to be part of the prior art.

The reference does not display a publication date.

The reference had been cited by a Third Party that merely contended that the reference was published before the filing date of the German application which corresponds to the priority date of the present US application. The Third Party asserted this without showing any appropriate proof.

Accordingly, it is clear that this reference is not part of the prior art.

Incidentally, the Third Party mentioned above did not file an opposition to the Grand of the German Patent.

. . . . .

The reference to Iverson merely describes a pressure booster. The Examiner has recognized that the subject matter of the present application is novel over the reference to Iverson and the Examiner does mention differences which exist between the reference to Iverson and the present application, as mentioned on page 5 of the Office Action, last paragraph, lines 8 to 13.

The Examiner has utilized the Hochdruck reference to demonstrate that the differences are described in the Hochdruck reference.

However, since the Hochdruck reference does not belong to the prior art, as discussed above, the combination of the references does not lead to the present invention as claimed.

Consequently, the present invention is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in

connection with the application may be charged to Patent and  
Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *FK Kueffner*  
Friedrich Kueffner  
Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: October 21, 2008

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in  
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box  
1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 21, 2008.

By: *FK Kueffner*  
Friedrich Kueffner

Date: October 21, 2008